# DAMBIÃO

INFORMATION

	nez'	MARÇ	·9	.WE2	C
		-A <b>-</b>			
MERICA	OE V	TATES	s a	NILE	Ω
OE NEM XC					

.jasbaələQ

(Conspiracy To Commit Investment Adviser Fraud and Mail Fraud)
The United States Attorney charges:

COUNT ONE

X-

## Relevant Persons And Entities

I. At all times relevant to this information, Bayou Fund LLC, was a hedge fund that had its principal office in Westchester County, New York and, thereafter, Stamford, Connecticut. Bayou Fund Ltd. was a hedge fund organized under the laws of the Cayman Islands. Bayou Management, LLC served as the investment adviser to Bayou Fund LLC and Bayou Fund Ltd. (hereafter, collectively referred to as the "Bayou Hedge Funds"), thom its office in Stamford, Connecticut. Bayou Securities, LLC, a broker-dealer registered with the United States Securities and Exchange Commission and a member of the National Association of Securities Dealers, acted primarily as a broker for the Bayou Hedge Funds. The Bayou entities will hereafter be referred to Securities Funds. The Bayou entities will hereafter be referred to

2. Bayou Fund LLC was formed in or about early 1996

7

:pailowing:

Israel and Marino would and did carry out the conspiracy were the Among the means and methods by which MARQUEZ,

## Means and Methods of the Conspiracy

things, that contained materially false statements. disseminating reports and financial statements, among other Daniel E. Marino perpetrated a scheme to defraud investors by in Bayou, JAMES G. MARQUEZ, the defendant, Samuel Israel III and and to lull existing investors into retaining their investments trading losses. In order to induce investors to invest in Bayou During the relevant time period, Bayou sustained

#### The Scheme To Defraud

.uoysa to erations of Bayou. Marino was a certified public accountant responsible for the Bayou. At all times relevant to this Information, Daniel E. responsible for the investment management and operations of G. MARQUEZ, the defendant, and Samuel Israel III, were At all times relevant to this Information, JAMES

securities.

investment strategy of conducting short-term trading of various sophisticated investors and earning profits by following an tormed for the purpose of obtaining contributions from Fund Ltd. was formed thereafter. The Bayou Hedge Funds were by the defendant, JAMES G. MARQUEZ, and Samuel Israel III. Bayou 6. From in or about July 1996 to on or about October

#### THE CONSPIRACY

Hedge Funds.

about October 10, 2001, MARQUEZ, Israel and Marino induced investors to contribute in excess of \$10,000,000 to the Bayou

d. In or about early 1999, MARQUEZ, Israel and Marino devised a plan, pursuant to which Marino created. Also accounting firm known as Richmond-Fairfield Associates. Also pursuant to the plan, MARQUEZ, Israel and Marino caused annual financial statements to be mailed to investors which falsely represented that Richmond Fairfield Associates audited Bayou.

e. From in or about July 1996 through on or

c. MARQUEZ, Israel and Marino had annual financial statements mailed to investors that contained, among other misrepresentations: (i) inflated rates of return on trading; (ii) inflated net asset values, and (iii) certifications that Bayou had been audited by a certified public accounting firm that Bayou had been audited by a certified public accounting firm that Bayou had been audited by a certified public accounting firm that Bayou had been audited by a certified public accounting firm that Bayou had been audited by a certified public accounting firm that Bayou had been audited by a certified public accounting firm that Bayou had been audited by a certified public accounting firm that Bayou had been audited by a certified public accounting firm that Bayou had been audited by a certified by a certified by a certification of the firm that Bayou had been audited by a certified by a certified by a certification of the firm that Bayou had been audited by a certified by a certification of the firm that Bayou had been audited by a certified by a certification of the firm that Bayou had been audited by a certification of the firm that Bayou had been audited by a certified by a certification of the firm that Bayou had been and the firm that Bayou had been and the firm that Bayou had been accounted by a certification of the firm that Bayou had been accounted by the firm that Bayou had been accounted by

b. MARQUEZ, Israel and Marino reported individual investors inflated accumulated profits in monthly reports and had those reports mailed to investors.

a. MARQUEZ, Israel and Marino reported fictitious rates of return of the Bayou Hedge Funds in quarterly reports and had those reports mailed to investors.

ħ

.71-d08

7. It was a part and object of the conspiracy that JAMES G. MARQUEZ, the defendant, along with Samuel Israel III and Daniel E. Marino, acting as investment advisers with respect to one and more clients and prospective clients in the Bayou Hedge funds, unlawfully, willfully, and knowingly, by the use of the activectly and indirectly, did (a) employ devices, schemes, and directly and indirectly, did (a) employ devices, schemes, and artifices to defraud clients and prospective clients; (b) engage in transactions, practices, and courses of business which operated as a fraud and deceit upon clients and prospective clients; and (c) engage in acts, practices, and courses of business that were fraudulent, deceptive, and manipulative, in business that were fraudulent, deceptive, and manipulative, in violation of Title 15, United States Code, Sections 80b-6 and violation of Title 15, United States Code, Sections 80b-6 and

## Investment Adviser Fraud

#### OBJECTS OF THE CONSPIRACY

10, 2001, in the Southern District of New York and elsewhere, JAMES G. MARQUEZ, the defendant, Samuel Israel III and Daniel E. Marino, unlawfully, willfully, and knowingly did combine, conspire, confederate, and agree together and with each other to adviser fraud, in violation of Title 15, United States Code, Sections 80b-6 and 80b-17; and (b) mail fraud, in violation of Title 18, United States Code,

b. At various times between July 1996 and

Connecticut.

a. At various times from in or about July 1996 through on or about October 10, 2001, MARQUEZ and Israel traded securities on behalf of Bayou through computers located in Westchester County, New York and at Bayou's offices in Stamford,

ejsempere:

9. In furtherance of said conspiracy and to effect the illegal objects thereof, the following overt acts, among others, were committed in the Southern District of New York and

#### OVERT ACTS

8. It was further a part and object of the conspiracy that JAMES G. MARQUEZ, the defendant, along with Samuel Israel III and Daniel E. Marino, unlawfully, willfully, and knowingly, having devised and intending to devise a scheme and artifice to and fraudulent pretenses, representations, and promises, did place and cause to be placed in a post office and authorized depository for mail matter, matters and things to be sent and delivered by the Postal Service, and private and commercial interstate carriers, and did take and receive therefrom such matters and things, in violation of Title 18, United States Code, matters and things, in violation of Title 18, United States Code, matters and things, in violation of Title 18, United States Code, matters and things, in violation of Title 18, United States Code,

limited to the following:

tinancial statements.

Manhattan.

elsewhere.

traceable to the commission of the offense, including but not and personal, that constitutes or is derived from proceeds U.S.C. § 981(a)(1)(C) and 28 U.S.C. § 2461, all property, real defendant, shall forfeit to the United States, pursuant to 18 alleged in Count One of this Information, JAMES G. MARQUEZ, the in violation of Title 18, United States Code, Section 371, 10. As the result of committing the conspiracy offense

## FORFEITURE ALLEGATION

(Title 18, United States Code, Section 371).

independent auditor that had audited Bayou and certified its falsely assert that Richmond-Fairfield Associates was an financial statements, MARQUEZ, Israel and Marino had Bayou

During the relevant time period, in annual

maintained an office for Richmond-Fairfield Associates in accounting firm named Richmond-Fairfield Associates and devised a plan in which Marino formed a sham certified public In or about 1999, MARQUEZ, Israel and Marino

investors located in the Southern District of New York and monthly reports and annual financial statements mailed to October 10, 2001, MARQUEZ, Israel and Marino had quarterly and/or

- Technology; and, (xi) all proceeds of the property at
- participating preferred stock of Integrated Fuel Cell
  - (x) 2004.3743 shares of series B-2 convertible
- ThermoEnergy Corp, identification no. WOS-PA3, expiring
- (ix) 341,211 warrants to purchase common stock of
  - ThermoEnergy Corp, identification no. W05-CW02,
  - (viii) 550,000 warrants to purchase common stock of
    - certificate No. 554;

expiring on 07/15/08;

:80/SI/LO UO

- stock certificate No. 640; (vii) 70,026 shares of common stock in HydroGen, stock
  - certificate No. 7480; (vi) 106,454 shares of common stock in HydroGen,
- certificate No. 7479; (v) 20,000 shares of common stock in KFx Inc., stock
- certificate No. 7478; (iv) 20,000 shares of common stock in KFx Inc., stock
- certificate No. 7477; (iii) 20,000 shares of common stock in KFx Inc., stock
- certificate No. 7476; (ii) 20,000 shares of common atock in KFx Inc., stock
- (i) 20,000 shares of common stock in KFx Inc., stock

## United States Attorney MICHAEL J. GARCIA

and Title 28, United States Code, Section 2461(c)). (Title 18, United States Code, Sections 981, 371, and 1341,

said defendant up to the value of the above forfeitable property. and 21 U.S.C. § 853(p), to seek forfeiture of any other property of it is the intent of the United States, pursuant to 18 U.S.C. § 982(b) subdivided without difficulty;

- (2) yas peen commingled with other property which cannot be
  - (4) has been substantially diminished in value; or

:qunoo

- (3) has been placed beyond the jurisdiction of the
  - a third person;
- (2) has been transferred or sold to, or deposited with,

diligence;

(1) cannot be located upon the exercise of due

a result of any act or omission of the defendant:

If any of the above-described forfeitable property, as

#### Substitute Asset Provision

Lot #4, Boca Grande, Florida 33921.

1621 Gaspar Drive South, Boca Grande Isles, PB 29, PG6,